

District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee (D4 BAC)
Minutes
July 18, 2012
1:30 PM – 3:30 PM
D4 HQ, 111 Grand Ave, Oakland, Mountain View Room, 15th Floor

Members Present (incl. teleconference attendees):

Paul Goldstein, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, D4 BAC Chair
Bruce “Ole” Ohlson, East Bay Bicycle Coalition, Delta Pedalers
Alan Forkosh, CA Association of Bicycling Organizations (via telephone)
Carol Levine, Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee; Bay Area Bicycle Coalition
Robert Cronin, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, San Mateo County
Gary Helfrich, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda County Transportation Commission

Non-Members Present (incl. teleconference attendees):

Ina Gerhard, Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Coordinator
Rob Bregoff, Caltrans District 4 Associate Planner
Jeanne Gorham, Caltrans D4 Landscape Architect
Lee Taubeneck, Caltrans D4 Deputy Director, Planning and Local Assistance
Nita Logan, Caltrans D4 Division Chief, Design North
Stefan Galvez, Caltrans D4 Environmental, BCDC & Coastal Commission Liaison
Lenka Culik-Caro, Caltrans D4 Deputy Director, Design
Wajahat Nyaz, Caltrans D4 Project Management
Gordon Brown, Caltrans HQ Design, Design Review D4 East
Jeanette Weisman, CH2MHill
Dan Dawson, Marin County Public Works
Jamie Sutton, Stinson Beach resident
Colin Hayne, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Alisha Oloughlin, Marin County Bicycle Coalition

2. Approval of April 18, 2012 Meeting Minutes

http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/d4_bac_mom_04182012.pdf

Due to lack of a quorum the minutes were not approved.

3. Committee Operational Issues - All

For more than three years Pat Giorni used to draft the meeting minutes (Pat: Again thank you for that). She wants to move on to doing other things.

Nobody volunteered to be the secretary and take the minutes on a regular basis. Rob and Ina agreed to do the minutes for this meeting and Carol Levine said she would do it next time.

\

4. Changes to the Highway Design Manual - Gordon Brown, CT HQ, D4 Design Reviewer

Gordon Brown presented the HDM changes pertaining to bicycle facilities and issues. He shared a spreadsheet listing the HDM changes (see agenda packet). Background: The Committee had commented on the HDM drafts when they were circulated for review in 2011.

The major change is that Chapter 1000 now only deals with Class I bikeways. All other bike facilities and design details are incorporated in the respective chapters throughout the manual. Specifically mentioned and discussed were the following sections:

- **Section 202.2:** Super-elevation: Table 202 refers to Class 2/3 bikeways.
- **Section 208.6:** Minimum height for ped/bike undercrossings is 10’.
- **Section 208.10 (6):** Final bicycle railing height language is forthcoming. A Caltrans study indicated that railing should be 48”, but did not address specific circumstances when bikes can go over the 48” railing. Standard now is 48” min, 42” next to a sidewalk.

There was discussion about concrete barrier retrofit projects to bring barriers up to 48” minimum and impact on views shed and scenery. Per Stefan Galvez, Caltrans is working with Coastal Commission to provide bridge railing types that minimize impacts to views and scenery on coastal highways.

- Section 301.2 (1): Bike lanes
 - Gary Helfrich noted that HDM should emphasize flexibility in bike facility standards so not to intimidate local agencies that want to accommodate cycling but do not have the right-of-way for standard facilities. Gordon Brown responded that if there is not sufficient width for example for a bike lane, the shoulder area is still available for bicycling. It should not be called Class II bike lane though.
 - Carol Levine emphasized that Class II bike lane standards next to parking (5’) and on roads where speed is more than 40 mph (6’) should be mandatory (“shall”) rather than advisory (“should”). If width is less, shoulder should not be striped as a bike lane; instead a wider outside lane would better serve the needs of cyclists. Generally, there was support from Committee for the “should” to “shall” change. Gordon Brown explained the rationale behind these advisory standards was to give CT districts more flexibility (mandatory standards need HQ approval for design exceptions, while exceptions to advisory standards can be approved by the districts). It was noted that standards also apply to local agencies.

Gordon emphasized the new language that bike lanes shall not be placed outside parking lanes. Many cities are in the process of installing these type of facilities (they should not be called bike lanes).

New HDM calls for 4’ min shoulder width for rehab projects. Formerly min. was 2’.

- **Section 302.1:** Rumble Strips: 4’ required shoulder width beyond the rumble strip. The question was raised why the required shoulder width outside of the rumble was reduced from 5’ to 4’? Gordon stated that before guidance was in the Standard Plans only, but not in

the HDM. It is unclear if standard plans will be changed. The Committee was in agreement that 5' shoulder width beyond the rumble, as shown in the Standard Plans, is preferable.

- **Section 303.4:** CA standard bulb-out width is 4-5' with 3' setback from the joint line (line at street side of gutter pan), so that cyclists are not forced into gutter. National guidance is 6' with 2' setback. There are no applicable safety studies for advantages of 2' vs 3' setback at bulb-outs for bikes. Gordon believes 3' is safer for inattentive pedestrians. Rochelle Wheeler noted that wider setbacks result in longer crossing distances and parked cars create visibility issues for pedestrians.
- **Section 403.6:** Standard to place bike lanes to the left of right-turn lane even if there is no Class II facility on the approach to prevent right-hook collisions.
- **Section 1003.1:** Class 1 minimum paved width remained 8', not 10' as stated in the initial draft.
- Michelle DeRobertis can send additional comments to Gordon for future consideration as the HDM is supposed to be a living.

5. Highway 1 (Marin/Sonoma) Storm Damage Repair Guidelines - Nita Logan, CT D4 Division Chief Design North

Nita Logan presented CT storm damage repair projects on Hwy 1 in Marin and Sonoma to get input on how such projects should provide for bike travel. Almost every year heavy storms cause the highway to fail at several locations and CT, together with permitting agencies (Golden Gate National Recreation Area, CA Coastal Commission, State Parks), has to determine the scope of repair/reconstruction.

CT wants to use the same standard on all projects - 12' lane and 4' shoulder – to provide for the variety of users in the corridor. Usually, the standard is 12' lane with 8' shoulder. Permitting agencies for the most part want to see changes to the character of Hwy 1 minimized as much as possible and there is opposition to the widening. CT thinks that the proposed design details are sensitive to context (walls are buried, other visual impacts minimized) and the 4' shoulder standard is a compromise given the safety benefits of shoulders. Marin and Sonoma Local Coastal Plans (LCP) have 4' shoulder width requirement. Regarding travel lane width, 11' lanes are considered inadequate for winding roads and larger vehicles. 12' will leave room for driver error.

The following bullet points highlight the main comments and points of discussion:

- Alisha Oloughlin: Endorses the 4' in general, but also wants to see variability in standards to fit location, i.e. shoulders are more important on uphill sections. If 4' are too invasive, 2'3' is better than nothing.
- Gary Helfrich: Corrects presentation regarding Sonoma County LCP to require 4' shoulder, it requires 5'. Questions the need for 12' lanes, in particular along the segment north of SR 116, many locations don't have room for wider shoulders.
- Presence of shoulders is more critical on ascents.

- Sometimes when road is engineered for safety, cars tend to speed up. It is important to maintain local character.
- Low vehicle speeds and low traffic volumes don't need so much shoulder.
- Class 1 not possible in the corridor because of ROW constraints and presence of parklands.
- Dan Dawson: Southern sections have much higher traffic volumes. He emphasized the need for wider shoulders for cyclists in those sections.
- Wider lanes = faster drivers. This issue was discussed at length and if and how it applies to Hwy 1. The committee felt that this was a safety trade-off, and sometime the engineering assumption that a wider lane was safer did not hold, because drivers used the extra width to speed up. Any project that results in wider lanes needs to look at this issue closely.
- Regarding guardrails: Shoulder is preferred over guardrail. If shoulder is provided, guardrail may not be necessary. With guardrails, 4' shoulder is needed for cyclists to escape roadway.

Ina mentioned that D4 System Planning has begun the development of a Transportation Concept Report (TCR). Suggests looking at new TCR guidance to incorporate Complete Streets at one of the next D4 BAC meetings.

6. Comments on CT's "Main Streets" Guidelines – All

Ina referred to the bicycle-relevant sections in the document and asked Committee members to submit comments, to her, if any. Although the deadline for comments has passed, HQ will probably still consider critical comments.

7. BRT and Bike Lanes on State Route 82 (El Camino Real) – Paul Goldstein, SVBC

This agenda item was postponed to one of the next meetings, because Michelle DeRobertis, who wanted to present the topic, was not able to attend.

8. Update on Projects – Ina Gerhard, CT and 9. Work Plan Review and Future Agenda Items - All

Both agenda items were tabled for lack of time and will have to be revisited at the next meeting. Committee members were asked to look at the Work Plan and be ready to discuss updates.

Remaining Meeting Date in 2012:

October 17, 2012